

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE  
Transcriber's Office  
FLOOR DEBATE

January 22, 2001 LR 1

much understanding of what it entails. But we often collectively legislate in that manner. We don't have any idea of what's going on. They say the moon is made out of green cheese. We say, what difference does that make? We believe physical laws will operate the same on green cheese as on stone, if the moon is stone. So, Ernie, what's your problem? I say, well, let me see if I can show you a difference in these physical properties of these two substances. I will take a brick of green cheese and put it in a sock and hit you upside the head with it. I will take a traditional brick and put it in a sock and bash you upside the head with it and see if you can then tell the difference, from experience, between green cheese and a brick, whereas you couldn't see the difference when I tried to engage your neurons and persuade you through argumentation. So what will it be this morning, the green cheese in the sock or the brick in the sock? It is serious, in my opinion, whenever we are talking about toying with, tinkering with, tweaking the constitution. If everybody understands thoroughly what is being said here and agrees with it, then the vote should be overwhelmingly in favor of this. But because I have a substantive basic disagreement with this language no matter how it is structured, the concept embraced in this language, I cannot vote for it. And, as Senator Beutler suggested, it may not really be clear now from the record, if you read it, exactly what is intended by those who are supporting this. Mr. President, in the interest of collegiality this morning, I will withdraw my amendment.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Chambers. Further debate on LR 1CA? Senator Stuhr, you're recognized to close.

SENATOR STUHR: Thank you, Mr. President and members of the body. I thank you for your discussion this morning. Hopefully, we have come to some resolution to this that it...after this discussion, that it is clear, and that was the point of this new legislative resolution and constitutional amendment, is to make it clearer to the voters and to all of you. The ballot language would simply state a constitutional amendment to clarify English language requirements in schools. And what we are doing is simply clarifying that point that we said in 1924...or in 1923, when the Supreme Court actually declared the statute that we